

STEPHEN N. HOLLMAN, ESQ., STATE BAR NO. 055219
Business & Technology Law Group
160 W. Santa Clara Street, Suite 1050
San Jose, CA 95113
Telephone (408) 282-1949
Facsimile (408) 275-9930

Attorneys for Defendant,
Counterclaimant, and Third Party Plaintiff,
PATRICIA CROWELL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WINE SCOUT INTERNATIONAL,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PATRICIA CROWELL,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C 07 05930 JSW

**NOTICE OF UNAVAILABILITY OF
COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT,
COUNTERCLAIMANT, AND THIRD
PARTY PLAINTIFF, PATRICIA
CROWELL**

[Electronic digital signatures permitted]

PATRICIA CROWELL, an individual

Counterclaimant,

vs.

WINE SCOUT INTERNATIONAL, a
California corporation,

Counterdefendant.

PATRICIA CROWELL, an individual

Third Party Plaintiff,

vs.

MARK STEVEN POPE, aka Mark S. Pope and
aka Mark Pope, individually and as he does
business under the trade name and style of
Bounty Hunter, Bounty Hunter Rare Wine,
and/or Bounty Hunter Rare Wine and
Provisions,

Third Party Defendant.

1 TO: PLAINTIFF AND COUNTERDEFENDANT, WINE SCOUT INTERNATIONAL, THIRD
 2 PARTY DEFENDANT, MARK STEVEN POPE, AND TO RESPECTIVE THEIR COUNSEL
 3 OF RECORD.

4 NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, commencing as of 1:00 p.m. (PDT) on Wednesday,
 5 August 6, 2008, and continuing through Sunday, August 10, 2008, STEPHEN N. HOLLMAN of
 6 BUSINESS & TECHNOLOGY LAW GROUP, counsel for defendant, counterclaimant, and
 7 third party plaintiff, PATRICIA CROWELL, will be away from and unavailable to be reached by
 8 his office for all purposes, including, but not limited to, the receipt of correspondence, demands,
 9 pre-trial discovery, or notices of any kind, appearing in Court, responding to *ex parte*
 10 applications, participating in telephone conferences, and/or attending depositions.

11 Notice is hereby given of the ruling in *Tenderloin Housing Clinic v. Sparks*, 8 Cal.App.4th
 12 299 (1993), regarding the timing of any correspondence, demands, pre-trial discovery, or notices
 13 of any kind, required appearances in Court, responding to *ex parte* applications, participating in
 14 telephone conferences, and/or attending depositions will be oppressive and constitute harassment
 15 if any of such matters neglects or ignores knowledge of the unavailability counsel to whom it is
 16 directed, and regarding the availability of sanctions for scheduling any conflicting matter during
 17 such period of unavailability of counsel.

18 On April 25, 2008 in an open Court proceeding, the Court's comment to a Notice of
 19 Unavailability of Counsel of this type was that the Court did expect that such a Notice of
 20 Availability would be received and treated by opposing counsel with professional courtesy and
 21 collegiality.

22
 23 DATED: August 5, 2008

BUSINESS & TECHNOLOGY LAW GROUP

24
 25 By: /s/ Stephen N. Hollman
 26 Stephen N. Hollman,
 27 Attorneys for Defendant,
 28 Counterclaimant and
 Third Party Plaintiff,
 PATRICIA CROWELL